

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, Alan Cranston was here in the Senate when I first arrived in 1983. He was a staunch advocate not only for California but also for a host of progressive policies at the national level. He was dedicated to protecting the environment, to expanding voter opportunities for all Americans, to closing the gap in our society between the rich and the poor. He was a champion of equal rights for all. He was a foe of bigotry in all its forms.

Perhaps his greatest passion during the years he served in the Senate was reducing the threat of nuclear war. He led the fight for arms control. Even after he left the Senate, he continued his work and spoke out for arms control and for the de-alerting of nuclear weapons.

I remember meeting with Alan last year at Ricky's Hyatt House in Mountainview, CA. I was in the Bay area, and I called ahead to see if he was available for breakfast. He said it was near his home and that he would meet me there.

He was a little less vigorous during that breakfast than he had been in earlier visits, but his commitment to arms reduction was undiminished. I remember thinking at the time how impressive it was to see someone who felt strongly enough about his views to find a way to continue advocacy of those views after leaving public office. It was clear that although he had left public office, he had not left public service.

Alan Cranston lived a remarkable life, and we are all fortunate that he devoted so much of that life to public service. I, for one, will miss Alan's wise counsel and his passionate commitment to making the world a better place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a subject that brings me great sorrow—the passing of my old friend and colleague, former California Senator Alan Cranston.

Senator Cranston passed away suddenly last New Year's Eve, at the age of 86. His sudden death came as a shock to all of us who remember him for his abundant energy and enthusiasm.

Alan was elected to this body for the first of four terms in 1968. He was already a legend in the Senate when I arrived here for the first time almost eighteen years after him, and I consider myself very fortunate to have had the opportunity to serve alongside him. I will always remember him fondly, both for the kind of person he was, and the kind of Senator he was.

Alan was elected Democratic whip an unprecedented seven straight times, and served in that role in both the majority and minority. Having now served as my party's whip for two years, I can say that nobody who holds that office can possibly ignore the long shadow that he still casts over it.

Recently, the Senate approved an historic power-sharing agreement

under which both parties would have an equal number of seats in each committee. It remains to be seen how this arrangement will work in practice, and whether the split will create more cooperation, or more gridlock.

But I think that if we in the Senate are to make it work, we would do well to follow the model set by Senator Cranston. Those of my colleagues who did not know him personally, would do well to study the lessons of his life and his career.

The press called him "Colorless Cranston," a nickname he wore with pride, because it reflected his fundamental belief that legislative accomplishment was far more important than crafting sound bites or scoring political points. When you needed to find Alan, you didn't look in the press gallery or the recording studio—you looked for him in the cloakroom, where he was always busy negotiating a compromise or finding ways to move legislation over obstacles.

Although he was known as one of the last true liberals, he never let his ideology get in the way of getting things done. He regularly reached out across the aisle and his close friends included some of his most vigorous and outspoken political opponents. He was a workhorse who lived by the maxim that a leader can accomplish great things if he doesn't mind who gets the credit.

Some of his greatest accomplishments found him in alliances that left outsiders scratching their heads—for example, teaming with STROM THURMOND to improve veterans' programs, with Alfonse D'Amato on public housing measures, with Barry Goldwater to protect first amendment press freedoms. Outsiders wondered whether he had sold out his old liberal beliefs, but the truth was that he was just finding ways to get things done with as little fuss as possible.

During his 24 years in the Senate, no legislation that touched on his passions—veterans' benefits, disarmament, environmental protection, human rights, or civil rights—passed this body without his fingerprints on it, although more often than not, only those closest to him realized the extent of his contribution.

During his long and colorful career, he crossed paths with some of the most famous men in history and was present many times while history was being made. He was a track star at Stanford and member of a record-setting relay sprint team. As a young journalist, he reported on the rise of Nazism in Germany, and was sued by Adolph Hitler for publishing an unsanitized version of "Mein Kampf" and revealing Hitler's true ambitions to the world. His lifelong commitment to halting the use of nuclear weapons began after he was introduced to Albert Einstein in 1946. After retiring from the Senate, he established a think tank with Mikhail Gorbachev to promote world peace, where he worked until his death. He

counted Groucho Marx among his supporters.

Yet despite these brushes with fame and the long list of bills that bear his name, he will always be best remembered in this body for the things that newspapers don't report—for his grace, his humility, his leadership, and his devotion to his son Kim and his granddaughter. He will be missed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring our friend and former colleague, Senator Alan Cranston, who died on December 31, 2000 at the age of 86 in his native California.

While Alan Cranston was elected to the United States Senate in 1968, his public service began years before when he served in the Executive Offices of the President in 1942 as Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information. Declining a deferment, he enlisted as a private in the United States Army in 1944. First assigned to an infantry unit, he became editor of "Army Talk" and was a Sergeant by V-J Day. He went on to serve two terms as State Controller of California before being elected to the United States Senate.

Alan Cranston served the people of California with distinction in the U.S. Senate for 24 years. He chaired the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, providing invaluable assistance to our Nation's servicemen and women. He was in the forefront in the U.S. Senate on numerous issues of national importance, including mass transit, civil rights, the environment, women's rights, housing and education.

I was privileged to serve with Senator Cranston on the Foreign Relations Committee where he played an important role during Senate consideration of the SALT II and START treaties, helped pave the way for ratification of the Panama Canal Treaty, and was active in efforts to promote peace in the Middle East. Senator Cranston was a tireless advocate for world peace and the defense of democratic institutions.

Throughout his Senate service, Alan Cranston worked diligently to promote the reduction and, ultimately, the elimination of nuclear weapons. After retiring in 1993, he continued his extraordinary commitment and devotion to these critical efforts. He chaired the State of the World Forum, a widely respected organization for the discussion of global problems based in San Francisco. He was also founder and President of the Global Security Institute, concentrating on a world-wide effort to reduce, marginalize and eliminate nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, Alan Cranston was a leader in the U.S. Senate, a well-respected member of this body. He had a unique ability to achieve consensus under difficult circumstances and his wise counsel will be missed by every member with whom he served. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him and to extend my deepest sympathies to his family.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Alan Cranston was a Senator in this Chamber for some long while. In fact, in recent months he visited this Chamber, and I had an opportunity to say a few words to him. He was someone who left a significant mark, especially in the area of fighting for a policy in this country that would put this country in a leadership position to reduce the threat of nuclear war.

Mr. Cranston worked diligently on that issue here in Congress, but after he left his service in the Senate, he especially was interested, and active all around this country, in trying to mobilize the energy and interest for this country to lead in a range of areas dealing with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. I recall, perhaps 6 months ago, driving down a rural highway in North Dakota and receiving a call on my cell phone. The call was from former Senator Alan Cranston, and he was calling from California. What he was calling about was what he always talked about in recent years. He was trying to find ways to continue our country's obligation to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear war.

He felt passionately about the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and was disappointed when the treaty was voted down in the Senate last year or a year and a half ago. But he never stopped working. He always believed that our country, as strong and as big as it is, had a leadership responsibility in the world to mobilize its energy and commitment to find ways to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

So today we pay honor to his memory. We should be thankful that there was an Alan Cranston involved in public service. I say to his family that our sympathies go to them. We will all miss his commitment in dealing with this issue of nuclear arms reduction.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 165 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN and Mr. BAUCUS pertaining to the introduction of S. 171 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DORGAN. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is conducting morning business.

WELCOMING SENATOR CLINTON

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, before I begin on the topic I wish to discuss, I welcome my neighbor and friend from across Lake Champlain, which many of us consider a great and beautiful lake. I am delighted to have the Senator from New York to be serving here in the Senate.

THE MEXICO CITY POLICY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I listened attentively to President Bush on Saturday when he called on all Americans to unite in a spirit of civility and common purpose. Those are sentiments we all share. I, for one, intend to make every effort, guided by conscience and my constituents, to work with the new administration for the good of the country.

I was also impressed by some of the things he said yesterday to his staff about treating every person with decency and respect and never taking the White House for granted. Those are important messages, and I commend the President for setting a tone of civility.

I also take the President at his word when he speaks of "working together to unite the country." I assume he means that on issues that have long divided us, he and his administration will make a sincere effort to bring people together.

But that doesn't happen simply by making a speech. Actions speak louder than words. On his first day in office, President Bush, by executive order, with no prior consultation with Congress, reinstated the controversial Mexico City policy on international family planning. The President explained his decision with these words:

It is my conviction that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions or advocate or actively promote abortion, either here or abroad. It is therefore my belief that the Mexico City policy should be restored.

Madam President, if current law did, in fact, permit taxpayer funds to be used to pay for or promote abortions overseas, then the President might have a point. But our law does not allow that. Our law explicitly prohibits any U.S. funds from being used for abortion or to promote abortion.

That is the settled law of the United States. It was passed by the Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. It is something we have all supported. In fact, it has been the law for as long as I can remember, even during past administrations. It is already against the law to use taxpayer funds for purposes related to abortion. Somebody should have told that to the new President.

In fact, the Mexico City policy, which he has reinstated, goes much, much further. Many have called it a "global

gag rule." It prohibits taxpayer funds from being used to support private family planning organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation. These organizations use a small portion of their own private funds—not taxpayer funds, but private funds—to provide advice, counseling, and information about abortions, and to advocate for safe abortion practices in countries where tens of thousands of women suffer injuries or die from complications from unsafe abortions.

If we tried to impose the Mexico City policy on any family planning organization within our borders, it would clearly violate the First Amendment. It would be illegal. But we impose it on those same organizations when they work overseas beyond the reach of our Constitution.

Proponents of the Mexico City policy maintain that it will reduce the number of abortions. The reality is the opposite. The distinguished Presiding Officer knows this very well. The International Planned Parenthood Federation, which is now going to be cut off from U.S. Government support, has used every tax dollar it received in the past to provide voluntary family planning services, like contraceptives, to couples who lack them. By providing for the first time modern birth control methods to people in countries where abortion was the primary method of birth control, the number of abortions goes down.

Now, taxpayer funds to the International Planned Parenthood Federation, which is comprised of dozens of family planning organizations around the world, are cut off.

I remember the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, former Senator Mark Hatfield, a dear friend of mine, one of the most revered Members of this body, who became chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator Hatfield was fervently pro-life, opposed to abortion, very strong in his beliefs. I remember a debate on the Mexico City policy when he stood here—and he probably said it best. I will quote what he said:

It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase. The Mexico City policy is unacceptable to me as someone who is strongly opposed to abortion.

President Bush's decision was not unexpected, based on what he said during the campaign. But I am disappointed because one would have hoped that after pledging to change the way we do business in Washington, after years of successive Congresses and administrations tying themselves in knots over this issue, his advisers would have taken the time to consult with the Congress about how to avoid the quagmire the Mexico City policy has produced in the past.

Now, had they done that, would an agreement have been possible? Who knows? There are strong passions on both sides of this issue, but they should